```
1
   STEVEN W. MYHRE
   Acting United States Attorney
 2
   District of Nevada
   BLAINE T. WELSH
   Assistant United States Attorney
 3
   Nevada Bar No. 4790
   333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 5000
   Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 5
   Phone: (702)388-6336
   Facsimile: (702)388-6787
 6
   E-mail: Blaine.Welsh@usdoj.gov
 7
   Attorneys for the United States
 8
 9
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                            DISTRICT OF NEVADA
11
   JOHN FRANCKI, et al.
12
                   Plaintiffs,
                                    Case No. 3:06-cv-0265-LRH-VPC
13
         VS.
   UNITED STATES, et al.,
14
15
                   Defendants.
16
17
    UNITED STATES' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE REPLY IN
       SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS AND TO EXCEED REPLY PAGE LIMIT
18
                             (FIRST REQUEST)
         Pursuant to LR 6-1, the United States respectfully requests
19
20
    that the time for the United States to file a reply in support of
   its Motion to Dismiss be extended through May 11, 2007 and that
21
   United States be allowed to file a reply longer than the normal
22
23
    twenty page limit allowed under LR 7-4.
24
         On March 19, 2007, the United States filed its Motion to
   Dismiss (Docket #63.) Plaintiffs and Co-Defendants requested and
25
   were granted a two week extension of time to respond to the
26
```

Motion to Dismiss (Docket #66 and 69). Plaintiffs and Co-Defendants then filed the following responses:

- Defendant Hologic, Inc.'s Opposition to Defendant United States' Motion to Dismiss filed on April 17, 2007 (Docket #70);
- Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant United States' Motion to Dismiss filed on April 19, 2007 (Docket #72);
- 3. Opposition of Defendant Radiation Detection Company to Defendant United States' Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in the Oppositions of Plaintiffs Francki, et al., and Hologic, Inc., to Motion to Dismiss of Defendant United States filed on April 20, 2007 (Docket #74); and
- 4. Defendant Hologic, Inc.'s Addendum to Its Opposition to Defendant United States' Motion to Dismiss filed on April 20, 2007 (Docket #75-1).

Based on the dates of service, the United States' replies to the above filings are currently due on May 1, 2007; May 3, 2007; and May 4, 2007, respectively. Rather than filing separate replies to each of these responses, the United States plans to file a single reply. The United States needs additional time to do so, however, and requests that the deadline for filing its reply be extended through May 11, 2007.

The reasons for the extension include the fact that counsel for the United States is currently working to supplement the administrative record in an Administrative Procedures Act case, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Bureau of Land

Management, et al., 2:06-cv-1293-LDG-LRL and is preparing for the June 4th trial in that same case. The Plaintiff in this case has filed an emergency motion for stay pending appeal of the Court's

injunction order. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has ordered the United States to respond by April 30, 2007. Counsel is also heavily involved in the management of the United States

Attorney's Office as Acting Administrative Officer and Civil Division Chief and under current staffing conditions counsel spends at least 75 percent of normal work hours dealing with administrative tasks. In addition, counsel for the United States will be out of the office on May 3, 2007 for the United States District Court for the District of Nevada's Annual Conference, and on May 4, 2007 attending his son's college graduation.

The United States also requests that this Court authorize the United States permission to file a reply brief in excess of twenty pages. Based on the number of arguments raised by the parties in their responses, the United States anticipates its reply brief will exceed the LR 7-4 twenty page limit. The United States will submit a table of contents and authorities with its reply.

This motion is not submitted merely for the purpose of delay or for any other improper reason.

20 . . .

- 21 . . .
- 22 | . . .
- 23 . . .
- 24 . . .
- 25 . . .
- 26 | . .

Counsel for the United States has conferred with opposing counsel about the requested extension of time and page limit. They do not oppose these requests. DATED this 26th day of April, 2007. STEVEN W. MYHRE Acting United States Attorney /s/ Blaine T. Welsh BLAINE T. WELSH Assistant United States Attorney IT IS SO ORDERED LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE DATED: May 1, 2007.